

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
JONESBORO DIVISION**

TED CHANDLER and MARTHA CHANDLER

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

3:12CV00104-BRW

JACOB ENGINEERING GROUP, INC., *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

1. Defendant’s Motion in Limine (Doc. No. 122) to preclude Plaintiffs from presenting evidence regarding the bid for the contract or payments made to APAC under the contract is DENIED, since this issue is better addressed during trial.

2. Defendant’s Motion in Limine (Doc. No. 123) to exclude reference to the fact that APAC was “paid with tax payer money” is GRANTED, since Plaintiffs concede the issue.¹

3. Defendant’s Motion in Limine (Doc. No. 124) to exclude suggestions and any witness testimony that APAC had a duty to comply with a more demanding standard of care than the one recognized by Arkansas law is DENIED, since this issue is better addressed during trial.

4. Defendant’s Motion in Limine (Doc. No. 125) seeks to exclude any reference by Plaintiffs that they serve as the primary caretaker for their granddaughter and any evidence that Plaintiff “had a good driving record” before the accident. The motion is DENIED with respect to the granddaughter. Regarding the driving record, Plaintiffs may raise this in rebuttal if Defendant puts the issue in through their expert or otherwise.

7. Defendant’s Motion in Limine (Doc. No. 128) to exclude “improper lay opinion testimony regarding medical causation” and evidence of medical expenses not causally

¹Doc. No. 137.

associated with the accident is DENIED at this time. Defendant may object during trial if Plaintiffs step out of bounds.

8. Defendant's Motion in Limine (Doc. No. 130) to exclude certain portions of video deposition is MOOT, since Plaintiffs responded that they "are not aware of any witness who will testify by video."²

IT IS SO ORDERED this 28th day of May, 2014.

/s/ Billy Roy Wilson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

²Doc. No. 141.